

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 have been examined on their merits.

Applicants herein cancel claims 2 and 6 without prejudice and/or disclaimer.

The Patent Office objects to claims 6-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants thank the Patent Office for indicating that claims 6-9 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicants herein add the recitations of claim 6 to claim 1, and have cancelled claim 6 without prejudice and/or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

1. The Patent Office objects to claim 6 as containing informalities. The objection to claim 6 is now moot due to its cancellation. The informality pointed out by the Patent Office has been corrected in the added recitations to claim 1.

2. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,543,053) in view of Belanger (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059402) and in further view of Eerola (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0203732). Applicants traverse the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 for at least the reasons discussed below.

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the recitations of claim 6, which the Patent Office has indicated would be allowable. Applicants submit that claim 1 is now allowable, and respectfully request that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1.

3. Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li *et al.* in view of Belanger and Eerola, and in further view of Haugli *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,279). The rejection of claim 2 is now moot due to its cancellation. Applicants traverse the § 103(a) rejection of claim 3 for at least the reasons discussed below.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 1 with the recitations of claim 6, which the Patent Office has indicated would be allowable. Applicants submit that claim 3 is now allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of claim 3.

4. Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li *et al.* in view of Eerola. Applicants traverse the § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 5 for at least the reasons discussed below.


Applicants have amended claim 4 with recitations that are similar in scope to amended claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 4 is now in condition for allowance for at least reasons analogous to those discussed for claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 4 is now allowable, and further submit that claim 5 is allowable as well, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 4. Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 5.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/771,633  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62025

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Wilson  
Registration No. 45,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 6, 2005